

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

Andrew Stephen Williams,

Case No. 24-cv-2548 (NEB/DJF)

Petitioner,

v.

ORDER

State of Minnesota, Second Judicial District
Court/Ramsey County District Court /Probate
Division-Civil Commitment; and Keith
Ellison, Attorney General,

Respondents.

This matter is before the Court on Petitioner Andrew Stephen Williams’s self-styled Motion for Correction of Clerical Error, Extension of Time to Submit Memorandum of Law and Reply to Respondent’s Filings, and Striking Respondent’s Motion and Pleadings (“Self-Styled Motion”) (ECF No. 15) and Motion for Sanctions (ECF No. 17).

Mr. Williams filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus on June 28, 2024 (“Petition”) (ECF No. 1). Defendant Keith Ellison filed a Motion to Dismiss Mr. Williams’s Petition on July 12, 2024 (ECF No. 9). August 8, 2024, the Court issued a Report and Recommendation that Mr. Williams’s Petition (ECF No. 1) be denied for lack of jurisdiction, Mr. Ellison’s Motion to Dismiss be denied as moot, and this matter be dismissed without prejudice (“August 8, 2024 Report and Recommendation”) (ECF No. 14).

I. Self-Styled Motion

Mr. Williams’s Self-Styled Motion asks the Court to: (1) correct clerical errors with respect to how he labeled and filed his Petition; (2) extend his time to respond to Mr. Ellison’s Motion to Dismiss; and (3) Strike Mr. Ellison’s Motion and Pleadings (ECF No. 15 at 2-6).

The Court construes Mr. William's request to correct clerical errors as a motion to amend his pleading. The Court denies his request as futile for the reasons set forth in its August 8, 2024 Report and Recommendation. (*See* ECF No. 14 at 1-4.)

Insofar as Mr. Williams seeks to extend his deadline to respond to Mr. Ellison's Motion to Dismiss, the Court finds he fails to establish good cause for a continuance and denies his request. An extension of the deadline is also unwarranted because the Court has already recommended Mr. Ellison's motion be denied as moot.

The Court also declines to strike Mr. Ellison's pleadings because it finds his Motion to Dismiss is not frivolous.

II. Motion For Sanctions

Mr. Williams asks the Court to impose sanctions on Mr. Ellison because he claims his Motion to Dismiss is improper, meritless, and unsupported factually or legally (ECF No. 17 at 2-3). The Court disagrees and declines to issue sanctions.

ORDER

Based on the foregoing, and on all of the files, records, and proceedings herein, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:**

1. Mr. Williams's self-styled Motion for Correction of Clerical Error, Extension of Time to Submit Memorandum of Law and Reply to Respondent's Filings, and Striking Respondent's Motion and Pleadings (ECF No. [15]) is **DENIED**; and

2. Mr. Williams's Motion for Sanctions (ECF No. [17]) is **DENIED**.

Dated: August 16, 2024

s/ Dulce J. Foster

DULCE J. FOSTER

United States Magistrate Judge

